

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

**BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

(3)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/841,475	04/24/2001	Darren P. Briggs	FATB 1000-1	4509
22470	7590	08/12/2004	EXAMINER	
HAYNES BEFFEL & WOLFELD LLP P O BOX 366 HALF MOON BAY, CA 94019			LIN, WEN TAI	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2154		

DATE MAILED: 08/12/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

(2)

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	09/841,475	BRIGGS ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Wen-Tai Lin	2154

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 April 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-32 and 34-54 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 33 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 24 April 2001 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All
  - b) Some \*
  - c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-54 are presented for examination.
2. Claims 10-15 are objected to because the term "the instant messaging buddy list" appears to lack antecedent basis in claims 10-15.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stirpe et al. (hereafter "Stirpe") [U.S. PGPub 20020087496].

5. As to claim 1, Stirpe teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method of sharing specific knowledge, including:

registering a user with a registration server to collect and share tracking data corresponding to at least a portion of the user's specific experiences [paragraph 41];

Art Unit: 2154

accessing one or more of the user's messaging buddy lists to identify one or more buddies with whom the tracking data may be shared [paragraph 24; note that a trainer is also considered a user of Stirpe's system, therefore his/her buddy lists are also recipients of the knowledge delivery system];

defining rights of the buddies to access the tracking data [paragraph 48; i.e., non-registered users may only access to knowledge components that are designated as free];

tracking at least a portion of the user's computer usage experiences and reporting the tracking data to a tracking server; and posting at least a portion of the user's tracking data for the buddies to access according to their defined rights [paragraphs 3 and 15].

Stirpe does not specifically teach that the sharing includes computer usage experiences.

However, since Stirpe's system is open of any topic that could be presented through a network, including courses offered at schools [paragraphs 162-163], it is obvious that the computer usage experiences could also be one of Stirpe's knowledge components, because sharing computer usages, such as "how to browse the Internet" is a subject of common interest.

6. As to claims 2-3, Stirpe does not specifically teach whether the registration server and the tracking server are a single server or distinct servers.

However, it is well known in art to adopt either a single server or a plurality of servers to perform registration and data tracking (e.g., database management) respectively, depending on the processing load. For the same reasons, it is obvious that Stirpe's system may employ either a single server or more than one servers to perform the registration and data tracking tasks because this is a design choice.

7. Claims 1-29, 32, 34-51 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olivier [U.S. Pat. No. 6480885].

8.

As to claims 1, 19 and 27, Olivier teaches the invention substantially as claimed including: a method of sharing specific knowledge, including:

registering a user with a registration server to collect and share tracking data corresponding to at least a portion of the user's specific experiences [col.9, lines 18-29];  
accessing one or more of the user's messaging buddy lists to identify one or more buddies with whom the tracking data may be shared [Abstract];  
defining rights of the buddies to access the tracking data [Abstract; 208, Fig.2; 524, Fig.9; i.e., the right of access is defined according to the acceptance criteria];  
tracking at least a portion of the user's computer usage experiences and reporting the tracking data to a tracking server; and posting at least a portion of the user's tracking data for the buddies to access according to their defined rights [216, 220, Fig.2],

wherein the user utilizes a computer and tracking is carried out by a module resident on the computer [Fig.2] and wherein the computer usage sending tracking data regarding one of a user's computer usage experiences to one or more buddies [216, 220, Fig.2].

Olivier does not specifically teach that the sharing includes computer usage experiences.

However, since Olivier's system is open of any topic that could be emailed through a network, it is obvious that the computer usage experiences could also be a sharing topic among the users, because sharing computer usages, such as "how to browse the Internet" is a subject of common interest.

9. As to claims 2-3, Olivier does not specifically teach whether the registration server and the tracking server are a single server or distinct servers.

However, it is well known in art to adopt either a single server or a plurality of servers to perform registration and data tracking (e.g., database management) respectively, depending on the processing load. For the same reasons, it is obvious that Olivier's system may employ either a single server or more than one servers to perform the registration and data tracking tasks because this is a design choice [col.8, lines 61-65].

10. As to claims 4-7, Olivier does not specifically teach excluding collection of the user's e-mail address, actual name, physical address or any information that identifies a user in a manner adapted to direct marketing at the time of registration.

However, Olivier does teach a feature of maintaining the users' privacy by avoiding revealing the users' identity or other information [col.14, lines 34-39 and col.15, lines 43-51]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that such practice could also be apply at the stage of registration because privacy is best maintained by not collecting the unintended items.

11. As to claims 8-9, Olivier establishing an anonymous unique identifier for the user [i.e., since Olivier teaches maintaining the users' privacy by avoiding revealing the users' identity or other information. As such, it is obvious that the IDs appearing along with the posted messages must be anonymous unique identifiers, because they need to be associated with each respective database record [col.6, line 63 – col.7, line7].

12. As to claims 10-15, Olivier does not specifically teach how the messaging buddy list is maintained, i.e., by AOL's Instant Messenger software, MSN Messenger software, Yahoo! Messenger software, America Online's ICQ software, Odigo's instant messenger software, or by Jabber's instant messenger software.

However, Olivier teaches that the method may also apply to group forums, such as web-based discussion boards, chat, online clubs, USENET newsgroups, voice mail, instant messaging, web browsing side channel communities, and online gaming rendezvous.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the various contact lists may be obtained from all the

aforementioned programs, because Olivier's criteria-matching method is applicable to group forums that are maintained by these messaging programs.

13. As to claims 16-18, Olivier does not specifically teach how the rights of the buddies are defined; i.e., by content category of the user's computer usage, by appearance of one or more keywords on pages corresponding to URLs viewed, or by activity type of the user's computer usage.

However, Olivier teaches that various group forums can be formed by matching the users' profile data, wherein the preference of topical subjects or any other criteria that may specify a specific group of common interest.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have used the aforementioned information for defining a special group forum because Olivier's generic method is applicable to specify any such intended group.

14. As to claims 20 and 23, Olivier does not specifically teach that the tracking is carried out by a device placed between a computer utilized by the user and an access point to the Internet.

However, it is well known in the art that user computers may be connected to an intranet having a proxy server intermediating the communication to the Internet, wherein the proxy server also tracks information exchanges between the user computer and the Internet.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the proxy server as a means for tracking the information [e.g., the email message], because by doing so inappropriate information or company proprietary information could be filtered before it is transmitted to the public domain.

15. As to claims 21-22, Olivier further teaches that the computer usage reported is filtered after it is reported to the tracking server and before it is posted for the buddies to access [col.3, lines 57-60; i.e., filtering the archived information into individualized archives, which is the base for reporting].

16. As to claims 24-26, Olivier does not specifically teach that the computer usage includes song listens by the user, video viewings by the user, or purchases by the user.

However, it is well that exchange information about songs listened, video viewed, and products purchased via the Internet, is popular topic in a chat room. It is obvious that these topics could also be criteria for forming Olivier's group forums, because Olivier's method is also applicable to deriving such groups.

17. As to claims 28-29, Olivier does not specifically teach categorizing at least a portion of the tracking data by content and sorting the tracking data by content category, and making the tracking data searchable by content category and date range.

However, since Olivier teaches that a web server creates an individualized set of web pages for a user from the database, containing contributions only

from users in his recipient list [Abstract: lines 15-17] and it is also well known that a database normally stores information by content category or at least can be indexed to by the content category, it would have been obvious to have Olivier's database organized in such a way that the content can be sorted or searched by its category and/or data range, because it's common to organize a database as such and by doing so it would facilitate querying the database.

18. As to claim 32, The method of claim 1, wherein posting further includes indexing text portions of at least a portion of pages reported from tracking the user's Internet usage [col.3, lines 23-32].

19. As to claims 34-51 and 53-54, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-29 and 32, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-29 and 32 above.

20. Claims 30-31 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Olivier [U.S. Pat. No. 6480885], as applied to claims 1-29, 32, 34-51 and 53-54 above, further in view of Stirpe et al.(hereafter "Stirpe") [U.S. PGPub 20020087496].

21. As to claims 30-31, Olivier does not specifically teach that posting further includes providing annotation tools for associating notes and ratings with individual tracking data entries.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Stirpe teaches a knowledge exchange system including an annotation service that allows a trainer or author to annotate web pages during live, self-paced or archived presentations [paragraph 30] and a rating system that is coupled with a search engine for determining the hotness of certain knowledge components.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to also provide an annotation and rating capabilities to Olivier's subscribers because it is common to have various comments during the "discussion" and an annotation tool would facilitate the group members to add addition information (such as rating of a topic or a concerned product) onto the original information.

22. As to claim 52, since the features of this claim can also be found in claims 30-31, it is rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 30-31 above.

23. Claim 33 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

24. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Wachtel [U.S. Pat. No. 6195654];

Lee et al. [U.S. PGPub 20030225836];

Art Unit: 2154

Kim et al. [U.S. PGPub 20020052925]; and

Demello et al. [U.S. PGPub 20010036224].

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

August 3, 2004



8/3/04